Drawing Amendments

There are no amendments to the drawings.

Remarks

The Office Action 07/17/2007 rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 9-11, 13-20, 26, 30, 31, 36, 38-40, 42-45, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0159053 of C. Fauble, et al. (hereafter referred to as Fauble). Finally, the Office Action rejected claims 3, 27, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Fauble in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117632 of P.D. Arling, et al. (hereafter referred to as Arling). Claims 1, 9, 11, 26, 31, 38, and 40 are being amended. Claims 10, 13-20, 39, 42-45, and 48 are being canceled.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 31, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Amended claim 1 recites:

> A method for protecting data generated by a keyboard, comprising the steps of:
> reading data from a keypad of the keyboard;
> reading an encryption seed from a device reader directly connected to the keyboard;
> encrypting the read data using the encryption seed; and
> directly transmitting the encrypted data from the keyboard to a computer wherein the encrypted data is not transmitted via the device reader to the computer and the computer and the device reader are different devices.

In rejecting amended claim 1, the Office Action stated the following:

> Fauble discloses a method for protecting data generated by a keyboard/secure keyboard console (fig. 4, #50), comprising the steps of: reading data from a keypad of a keyboard; reading the

> encryption seed/encryption key, from a device reader/computing device (fig. 4, #42), connected to the keyboard (fig. 4, #50); encrypting the read data using the encryption seed (¶ [0031-0032]); and transmitting the encrypted data from the keyboard to a computer/second computing device (fig. 4, #44).

Amended claim 1 clearly recites "directly transmitting the encrypted data from the keyboard to a computer wherein the encrypted data is not transmitted via the device reader to the computer and the computer and the device reader are different devices". In Fauble, keyboard 50 does get the encryption seed from first computing device 44 but does not directly transmit encrypted data to the second computing device 44; rather, keyboard 50 transmits the encrypted data via first computing device 42 to second computing device 44. The computer and device reader of amended claim 1 are clearly recited as being different devices. Clearly, Fauble discloses a different type of operation than that recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Fauble under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Dependent claims 2 and 7 are directly dependent on amended claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1.

Claims 31 and 36 are patentable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 7.

Rejection of Claims 9, 11, 38, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Amended claim 9 incorporates material from canceled claim 10 and recites:

A method for protecting data generated by a keyboard, comprising the steps of:

generating a start signal by at least one of a special key on a keypad of the keyboard or multi-actuation of a number of keys on the keypad;

reading data from the keypad following generation of the start signal wherein the read data and the start signal are distinct;

encrypting the read data in response to the start signal;

transmitting the encrypted data from the keyboard to a computer;

receiving a unique stop signal from the keypad;

stopping the encryption of the read data and transmission of the encrypted data from the keyboard to the computer in response to the stop signal.

In rejecting claim 9, the Office Action on page 4 states that "Fauble discloses a method for protecting data generated by a keyboard comprising the steps of: generating a start signal by at least one of a special key on keyboard or multi--actuation of a number of keys on the keyboard (¶ [0029]), reading data from a keypad of the keyboard (¶[0034]); and transmitting the encrypted data from the keyboard to a computer (fig. 4)." Paragraph [0029] does not disclose a generation of a start signal by a special key or multiple-actuation of a number of keys on a keyboard. In fact, Paragraph [0029] does not disclose the generation of a start signal by any means. Applicants would appreciate if the Examiner would specifically point out where in Paragraph [0029] the Examiner finds such a disclosure. Further, Paragraph [0034] does disclose encrypting data from a keyboard but does not disclose or suggest that this is done in response to a start signal generated by the keyboard. Note, that amended claim 9 is very clear that reading data to be encrypted follows the generation of the start key and that the

start key and the read data being encrypted are distinct. Paragraph [0034] definitely does not disclose or suggest this type of operation. Rather, as disclosed in Paragraph [0031], the second computing device 44 in conjunction with the first computing device 42 starts the encryption process.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 9 is patentable over Fauble under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claim 11 is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 9.

Claims 38 and 40 are patentable for reasons similar to claims 9 and 11.

Rejection of Claims 26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Amended claim 26 recites:

> A keyboard for encrypting data before transmission to a computer directly connected to the keyboard via a link, comprising:
> an interface connected to the link;
> a memory;
> a keypad for generating the data;
> a device interface for reading a directly connected device reader to obtain a seed for an encryption routine wherein the device reader and the computer are different devices;
> a processor for encrypting using the seed from the device reader the generated data from the keypad by execution of the encryption routine stored in the memory; and
> directly transmitting the encrypted data to the computer via the interface and link bypassing the device reader and device interface.

In rejecting claim 26, the Office Action on page 6 states "Fauble discloses a keyboard/secure keyboard console (fig. 7, #50), for encrypting data before transmission to a computer/user computing device (fig. 7, #82) directly connected

to the keyboard via a link/keyboard cable, comprising: an interface connected to the link user computing device; a memory (fig. 7, #54, 56, 58); a keypad for generating the data; a device reader/user computing device (fig. 7, #82) for reading a directly connected device to obtain a seed/encryption key, for an encryption routine; a processor/keyboard processor (fig. 7, #60), for encrypting using the seed/encryption key, the generated data by execution of the encryption routine stored in the memory; and transmitting the encrypted data to the computer via the interface and the link (¶ [0034])."

The Office Action clearly equates the computer of amended claim 26 with computing device 82. Also, the Office Action clearly equates the device reader of amended claim 26 with computing device 82. However, amended claim 26 clearly recites "wherein the device reader and the computer are different devices". Clearly, the Office Action can not equate computing device 82 with both the computer and device reader of amended claim 26. In addition, bank server 84 can not be equated to the computer of amended claim 26 since amended claim 26 clearly recites "directly transmitting the encrypted data to the computer via the interface and link bypassing the device reader and device interface". Figure 7 of Fauble clearly illustrates that secure keyboard console 50 can only transmit information to bank server 84 via computing device 82.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 26 is patentable over Fauble under 35

U.S.C. 102(e). Dependent claim 30 is directly dependent on amended claim 26 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 26.

Rejection of Claims 3, 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Fauble in view of Arling. However, Arling was only cited for disclosing a wireless link; hence claim 3 is still patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1. Dependent claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Fauble in view of Arling. However, Arling was only cited for disclosing a wireless link; hence claim 27 is still patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 26. Dependent claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Fauble in view of Arling. However, Arling was only cited for disclosing a wireless link; hence claim 32 is still patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 31.

Summary

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request consideration of amended claims 1, 9, 11, 26, 31, 38, and 40, reconsideration of remaining claims, as presently in the application, and allowance of these claims.

Although the foregoing is believed to be dispositive of the issues in the application, if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution, the

Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully,

Christopher Reon Gentle
Julian James Orbach

By John C. Moran
John C. Moran
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 30,782
303-450-9926

Date: 09/17/2007

John C. Moran, Attorney, P.C.
4120 115th Place
Thornton, CO 80233